



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,791	04/05/2001	Lee Harland	PCS10914ADAM	4080

7590

03/25/2002

Gregg C. Benson
Pfizer Inc.
Patent Department, MS 4159, Eastern Point Road
Groton, CT 06340

EXAMINER

CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1646

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/826,791

Applicant(s)

HARLAND, LEE

Examiner

Olga N. Chernyshev

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:1 is merely a slightly truncated version of the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:5. This was found to be persuasive and Groups I and II have been rejoined.

Claims 7-21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6.

Claims 1-6 and 22 are under examination in the instant office action.

Drawings

2. It is noted that Figure 2 of the instant application is not in compliance with the rules of sequences presented in drawing figures (see MPEP 2422.02). Appropriate correction is required.

3. It is noted also that the instant specification contains sequences in Figures 6 and 7 and Sequence Listing as a part of Specification. It is suggested that Figures 6 and 7 are deleted from the Specification in order not to duplicate information.

Specification

4. The use of the trademark has been noted in this application (page 73, line 20). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Art Unit: 1646

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Applicant is advised to carefully check the specification for other possible incorrect presentation of trademarks.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 4 depends from claim 1 and claim 4. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Accordingly, the claim 4 is not been further treated on the merits.

6. Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 5 depends from itself. Applicant is advised that for the purpose of examination claim 5 is interpreted as being dependent from claim 4. Consequently, claims 5 and 6 are withdrawn from further consideration as being dependent from the improperly dependent claim.

7. Claims 1-3 and 22 are under examination in the instant office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1-3 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is drawn to an invention with no apparent or disclosed specific and substantial credible utility. The instant application has provided a description of an isolated DNA encoding a protein and the protein encoded thereby. The instant application does not disclose the biological role of this protein or its significance.

It is clear from the instant application that the protein encoded by the claimed isolated nucleic acid molecule described therein is what is termed an "orphan protein" in the art. The DNA of the instant application has been isolated because of its similarity to a known DNA. There is little doubt that, after complete characterization, this DNA and encoded protein may be found to have a specific and substantial credible utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and until it has been undertaken, Applicant's claimed invention is incomplete. The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sus. Ct, 1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anti-cancer activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an anti-tumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are "useful" as it appears in 35 U.S.C. § 101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediate obvious or fully disclosed "real world" utility. The court held that:

"The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility", "[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field", and "a

Art Unit: 1646

patent is not a hunting license”, “[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion”.

The instant claims are drawn to a DNA and the protein encoded thereby of as yet undetermined function or biological significance. It is clear from the instant application that “The present invention relates to a novel polynucleotide sequence which encodes a novel polypeptide [PFI-017] belonging to the class of proteins known as G-protein coupled receptors (GPCRs)” that encode membrane associated proteins and receptors” (page 1, lines 8-10 of the instant specification). The specification asserts further “As GPCRs are involved in signal transduction, modulators (e.g. agonists or antagonists) of the polypeptide of the present invention can find use in interfering in the signal transduction process” (page 7, lines 29-31). It is also suggested that “PFI-017-encoding polynucleotide sequence may be used for the diagnosis of diseases resulting from expression of PFI-017” (page 62, lines 13-14). However, in the absence of knowledge of the biological significance of this specific polynucleotide and encoded protein, there is no immediately obvious patentable use for the polynucleotide or the encoded protein. The similarity of the disclosed polynucleotide to polynucleotides encoding G-protein coupled receptors does not make the instant polynucleotide or encoded protein useful or significant as the known polynucleotides. “The present invention also provides a pharmaceutical composition for treating an individual in need of the same due to PFI-017 activity (page 65, lines 6-7). There is no evidence of record, which associates the instant DNA or encoded protein with any diseases or disorder. Furthermore, it is known from the prior art that in spite of the fact that “a substantial degree of amino acid homology is found among members of [GPCR], but comparisons between subfamilies show significantly less or no similarity” (see Tae et al., page 17299, first paragraph and the whole paper). It is also a general knowledge that amino acid structure cannot necessarily

Art Unit: 1646

predict the function of the protein: "Knowing the protein structure by itself is insufficient to annotate a number of functional classes and is also insufficient for annotating the specific details of protein function" (see Skolnick et al., Box 2 on page 36). There are numerous publications available for review that indicate that even two-amino acid substitution in a molecular structure of a protein can lead to total loss of a protein to bind a specific receptor (see, for example, Yan et al., 2000). Thus, the structural homology of the proteins of the present invention to the proteins with a known function cannot *a priori* be predictive and conclusive of a function of the claimed proteins.

Therefore, to employ the polynucleotide and the protein in the future methods "of identifying agents [...], the activity of PFI-017" (page 58, lines 9-11) is not a real world because it would eventually relate to a protein for which no biological function is known. The instant application also fails to demonstrate use of the protein as a marker for any disease or condition (which would be a real world use). Because the instant specification does not teach a biological activity of the protein, one cannot prevent or treat a condition or disease as implied by the specification. To employ a polynucleotide of the instant invention in any of the disclosed methods would clearly be using it as the object of further research, which has been determined by the courts to be a utility, which, alone, does not support patentability. Since the instant specification does not disclose a credible "real world" use for the encoded protein then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being useful.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-3 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because since the claimed invention is not supported by either a clear asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for reciting a polynucleotide that is complementary to the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:1 and encodes a G-protein coupled receptor. The instant specification does not provide the structural information needed to produce a nucleic acid molecule that can meet the limitations of the claim. Applicant is advised that the instant specification provides guidance needed for producing nucleic acid molecule of SEQ ID NO:1 that encodes the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2

11. Claims 1-3 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1646

The invention appears to employ novel vectors and/or microorganisms. Since the microorganism is essential to the claimed invention it must be obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification or otherwise be readily available to the public. The claimed plasmids' sequences are not fully disclosed, nor have all the sequences required for their construction been shown to be publicly known and freely available. The enablement requirements of 35 USC § 112 may be satisfied by a deposit of the plasmid and/or microorganism. The specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the microorganism and it is not apparent if the DNA sequences and/or microorganism are readily available to the public. Accordingly, it is deemed that a deposit of these plasmids and/or microorganisms should have been made in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.801-1.809.\.

It is noted that applicants have deposited the organism but there is not indication in the specification as to public availability. If the deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by applicants, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific strain has been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the strain will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.801-1.809, applicants may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;

Art Unit: 1646

- (b) all restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer; and
- (d) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. Claim 1 is indefinite for recitation of "stringent" hybridization conditions. Claim 1 is directed to a nucleic acid molecule, which hybridizes under "conditions of moderate stringency". The limitation "conditions of moderate stringency" is conditional and the defining conditions are not recited in the claim or the specification.

14. Claims 2 and 3 are indefinite for being dependent from the indefinite claim.

Conclusion

15. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (703) 305-1003. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9 AM to 5 PM ET.

Art Unit: 1646

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (703) 308-6564. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 782-9306 for regular communications and (703) 782-9307 for After Final communications.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax center located in Crystal Mall 1 (CM1). The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4556 or (703) 308-4242. If either of these numbers is out of service, please call the Group receptionist for an alternative number. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294. Official papers should NOT be faxed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D.
March 21, 2002

OC


JOHN ULM
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800